Positive selection and relaxed purifying selection contribute to rapid evolution of

male-biased genes in a dioecious flowering plant

Lei Zhao[1#], Wei Zhou[1#], Jun He[1], De-Zhu Li[1, 2*], Hong-Tao Li[1, 2*]

[1]Germplasm Bank of Wild Species, Yunnan Key Laboratory of Crop Wild Relatives

Omics, Kunming Institute of Botany, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Kunming,

Yunnan 650201, China

[2]Kunming College of Life Science, University of Chinese Academy of Sciences,

Kunming, Yunnan 650201, China

[#] These authors contributed equally to this article

Running title: Positive selection and relaxed selection driving rapid evolution of male-

biased genes

* Corresponding authors:

Hong-Tao Li lihongtao@mail.kib.ac.cn;

De-Zhu Li dzl@mail.kib.ac.cn

Abstract

Sex-biased genes offer insights into the evolution of sexual dimorphism. Sex-biased genes, especially those with male bias, show elevated evolutionary rates of protein sequences driven by positive selection and relaxed purifying selection in animals. Although rapid sequence evolution of sex-biased genes and evolutionary forces have been investigated in animals and brown algae, less is known about evolutionary forces in dioecious angiosperms. In this study, we separately compared the expression of sex-biased genes between female and male floral buds and between female and male flowers at anthesis in dioecious *Trichosanthes pilosa* (Cucurbitaceae). In floral buds, sex-biased gene expression was pervasive, and had significantly different roles in sexual dimorphism such as physiology. We observed higher rates of sequence evolution for male-biased genes in floral buds compared to female-biased and unbiased genes. Male-biased genes under positive selection were mainly associated with functions to abiotic stress and immune responses, suggesting that high evolutionary rates are driven by adaptive evolution. Additionally, relaxed purifying selection may contribute to accelerated evolution in male-biased genes generated by gene duplication. Our findings, for the first time in angiosperms, suggest evident rapid evolution of male-biased genes, advance our understanding of the patterns and forces driving the evolution of sexual dimorphism in dioecious plants.

Introduction

Sexual dimorphism is the condition where sexes of the same species exhibit different morphological, ecological and physiological traits in gonochoristic animals and dioecious plants, despite male and female individuals sharing the same genome except for sex chromosomes or sex-determining loci (Mank, 2009; Barrett and Hough, 2013). Such sexual dimorphisms usually arise from differential expression of genes between the two sexes, i.e., sex-biased genes (including sex-specific genes expressed exclusively in one sex) that are located on autosomal chromosomes and sex chromosomes/or sex-determining regions (Ellegren and Parsch, 2007; Parsch and Ellegren, 2013; Grath and Parsch, 2016; Charlesworth, 2018; Tosto et al., 2023). Recently, some studies have begun to explore the strength and impact of evolutionary forces that shape different sexually dimorphic traits through sex-biased gene expression (Mank, 2009; Rowe et al., 2018; Naqvi et al., 2019; Cai et al., 2021; Mank, 2023; Murat et al., 2023; Singh and Agrawal, 2023). Previous studies revealed that sex-biased gene expressions were associated with the evolution of sexual dimorphisms in some animal species, although the extent of this bias exhibits great variation among taxa, tissues, and development stages (Mank, 2017; Hsu et al., 2020; Khodursky et al., 2020; Lichilin et al., 2021; Toubiana et al., 2021; Djordjevic et al., 2022; Yue et al., 2023). Unlike most animals, the vast majority (~90%) of flowering plants (angiosperms) are hermaphroditic, while only a small fraction (~5%) are dioecious in which individuals have exclusively male or female reproductive organs (Renner, 2014). Most dioecious plants possess homomorphic sex-chromosomes that

are roughly similar in size when viewed by light microscopy (Palmer et al., 2019).

Furthermore, sexual dimorphism in dioecious plants is less common and less

conspicuous than in most animals (Barrett and Hough, 2013). Hence, the study of sex-

biased gene expression is of great interest to plant evolutionary biologists, as it is

necessary to understand the evolution of sexual dimorphism in dioecious plants

(Moore and Pannell, 2011).

A common pattern that has emerged from previous studies is that sex-biased

genes, particularly male-biased genes, tend to evolve rapidly in protein sequence (the

ratio of non-synonymous to synonymous substitutions, d_N/d_S) compared to unbiased

genes (Ellegren and Parsch, 2007; Grath and Parsch, 2016). The rapid evolution of

male-biased genes was first observed in *Drosophila melanogaster* (Zhang et al., 2004;

Zhang and Parsch, 2005) and has been supported by recent investigations in a wider

range of animals (Pröschel et al., 2006; Mank et al., 2007; Mank, 2017; Papa et al.,

2017; Catalan et al., 2018; Toubiana et al., 2021). In recent years, there have been

growing studies on the expression dynamics and molecular evolutionary rates of sex-

biased genes in flowering plants, including hermaphroditic *Arabidopsis thaliana*

(Gossmann et al., 2014; 2016), *Solanum* (Moyle et al., 2021), and dioecious *Silene*

latifolia (Zemp et al., 2016), *Salix viminalis* (Darolti et al., 2018), *Mercurialis annua*

(Cossard et al., 2019), *Populus balsamifera* (Sanderson et al., 2019), and

Leucadendron (Scharmann et al., 2021). However, despite such advances, the

molecular evolution pattern of sex-biased genes in plants remains inconsistent among

the studied plant species (Muyle, 2019; Veltsos, 2019). In dioecious plants such as

Mercurialis annua and *Leucadendron*, Cossard et al., (2019) and Scharmann et al.,

(2021) found no significant differences in evolutionary rates of proteins among

female-biased, male-biased and unbiased genes detected between male and female

plants leaf tissues, although the expression of sex-biased genes was highly different

from unbiased genes in leaves. Similar patterns have also been reported in dioecious

Populus balsamifera, where evolutionary rates of male-biased, female-biased and

unbiased genes did not differ in reproductive tissues (Sanderson et al., 2019).

However, in the dioecious *Salix viminalis*, male-biased genes have significantly lower

evolutionary rates of proteins than female-biased and unbiased genes in catkin tissues

(Darolti et al., 2018). To our knowledge, only the five above-mentioned studies have

investigated expression differences and protein evolutionary rates of sex-biased genes

in dioecious angiosperms. Moreover, these studies only compared gene expression in

vegetative versus vegetative tissues and vegetative versus reproductive tissues,

limiting our understanding of sexual selection at different floral development stages.

Therefore, more studies and taxa are needed to explore the common patterns of

sequence evolution in sex-biased genes, with more focus on comparing sex-biased

gene expression in reproductive versus reproductive tissues, e.g., different floral

development stages in dioecious angiosperms.

Evolutionary analyses indicate that different driving forces impact the rate of

sequence evolution of sex-biased genes. These forces include positive selection,

which promotes the spread and adaptive fixation of beneficial alleles; sexual

selection, which results from male-male competition or female choice; and relaxed

purifying selection, which reduces the removal of deleterious mutations (Grath and

Parsch, 2016; Mank, 2017; Dapper and Wade, 2020). For example, in animal systems,

particularly in *Drosophila*, the elevated sequence divergence rates of male-biased

genes have often been interpreted as the signature of adaptive evolution, suggesting

that sexual selection is the primary evolutionary force (Pröschel et al., 2006; Assis et

al., 2012). In brown algae, female-biased and/or male-biased genes exhibited higher

evolutionary rates than unbiased genes, suggesting that rapid evolution is partly

driven by adaptive evolution or sexual selection (Lipinska et al., 2015; Cossard et al.,

2022; Hatchett et al., 2023). However, studies in plants have never reported elevated

rates of sex-biased genes.

An alternative explanation for the rapid evolution of sex-biased genes is a

relaxation of purifying selection due to reduced constraints (Lahti et al., 2009; Dapper

and Wade, 2020). In the model plant *Arabidopsis thaliana*, pollen genes were found to

be evolving faster than sporophyte-specific genes due to relaxed purifying selection

associated with the transition from outcrossing to selfing (Harrison et al., 2019).

These trends were recently confirmed in *Arabis alpina*, which exhibits mating system

variation across its distribution, suggesting that the efficacy of purifying selection on

male gametophyte-expressed genes was significantly weaker in inbred populations

(Gutierrez-Valencia et al., 2022). Together, these findings in plants reinforce the idea

that both adaptive (e.g., positive selection, sexual selection) and non-adaptive (e.g.,

relaxed selection) evolutionary processes differentially impact the sequence evolution

of sex-biased genes. Hence, investigating the potential contribution of selection forces

to the emergence of specific evolutionary patterns of sex-biased genes within a focal

species is of great interest.

In the family Cucurbitaceae, there are about 96 genera and 1,000 species, about

50% of species are dioecious, and the others are monoecious (Schaefer and Renner,

2011). Phylogenetic analyses of Cucurbitaceae suggest that dioecy is the ancestral

state of the family, but transitions frequently to monoecy (Zhang et al., 2006).

Trichosanthes pilosa (synonym: *T. ovigera*, 2n = 22, Cucurbitaceae) is mainly

distributed from Southwest and Southeast China to Japan, extending to Southeast

Asia, New Guinea and Western Australia. It was suggested to have originated in the

late Miocene (ca. 8-6 million-year ago) (de Boer et al., 2012; 2015; Guo et al., 2020).

Trichosanthes pilosa is a perennial, night-flowering, insect-pollinated dioecious vine

that reproduces sexually and possesses a pair of heteromorphic sex chromosomes

XX/XY (Ming et al., 2011). The male parts (e. g., anthers) of female flowers, and the

female parts (e. g., pistil and ovaries) of male flowers are fully aborted. However, its

male and female flowers exhibit strong sexual dimorphism in floral morphological

and phenological traits, such as racemose versus solitary (Fig. 1), early-flowering

versus late-flowering, and caducous versus long-lived (Wu et al., 2011).

To understand the evolution of sex-biased genes in dioecious *T. pilosa*, we

collected floral buds and flowers at anthesis from male and female individuals and

characterized their expression profiles using Illumina RNA sequencing. Our primary

objectives are to 1) compare expression divergence between males and females at two

floral development stages; 2) explore whether there are differences in the evolutionary

rates of proteins among female-biased, male-biased and unbiased genes; and if so, 3)

determine the main selective forces that contribute to the differentiation of sequence

evolution rates among gene categories.

Results

Transcriptome sequencing, *de novo* assembly and annotation

Using whole transcriptome shotgun sequencing, we sequenced floral buds and

flowers at anthesis from female and male of dioecious *T. pilosa*. We set up three

biological replicates from three female and three male plants, including 12 samples in

total (six floral buds and six flowers at anthesis). We then generated a total of nearly

276 million clean reads (Table S1). Due to the absence of a reference genome, we

performed *de novo* assembly of transcripts from all the clean reads, followed by

clustering and filtering analysis, resulting in 59,051 unigenes (Fig. S1A). To evaluate

the quality of the assembled unigenes, we used BUSCO assessments based on

embryophyta_odb10 database, which showed the completeness of the reference

transcriptome at 89.7% (Table S2). We then annotated them against protein databases

including NR, KEGG, Swissport, PFAM, and GO using BLASTP and nucleotide

database NT using BLASTN (Table S2). The e-value distribution of the best hits in

NR database suggested that 47,241 unigenes (80%) had strong homology, with an e-

value smaller than 1.0e-15 (Fig. S1B). The majority of unigenes were annotated by

homologs in species of Cucurbitaceae (61.6%, 36,375), such as *Momordica charantia*

(16.3%, 9,625), *Cucumis melo* (11.9%, 7,027), *Cucurbita pepo* (11.9%, 7,027),

Cucurbita moschata (11.5%, 6,791), *Cucurbita maxima* (10.1%, 5,964), and other

species (38.4%, 22,676) (Fig. S1C). Overall, our assessment suggested that we have

generated high-quality reference transcriptomes.

Expression characteristics of sex-biased genes

We mapped the RNA-Seq reads of floral buds and flowers at anthesis onto the

reference transcriptome in dioecious *T. pilosa*, which resulted in approximately 75%

read mappings per sample (Table S3). In floral buds, we identified 5,096 (9.50%)

female-biased genes and 4,214 (7.86%) male-biased genes (Fig. 2A). In contrast, only

380 (0.70%) female-biased genes and 233 (0.43%) male-biased genes were detected

in flowers at anthesis (Fig. 2B). Using hierarchical clustering analysis, we evaluated

different levels of gene expression across sexes and tissues (Fig. 2C), revealing that

female floral buds maybe tend to masculinize, and vice versa in the early stages of

floral development. Furthermore, we observed that the number of sex-biased genes in

floral buds was approximately 15 times higher than in flowers at anthesis, indicating

that sex-biased genes associated with meiotic processes, sex differentiation and

sexually dimorphic traits are predominantly expressed in floral buds. We also

analyzed sex-specific genes that were exclusively expressed in floral buds and flowers

at anthesis of one sex. In floral buds, we found 253 out of 5,096 (4.96%) female-

specific genes and 465 out of 4,214 (11.03%) male-specific genes. However, in

flowers at anthesis, we only identified 26 out of 380 (6.84%) female-specific genes

and 52 out of 233 (22.32%) male-specific genes. Taken together, sex bias is more

prevalent in floral buds than in flowers at anthesis.

Tissue-biased/stage-biased gene expression

We compared the expression levels of transcripts in floral buds and flowers at

anthesis within each sex to identify genes with tissue-biased expression. In male

plants, the number (M2TGs: n = 2,795) of tissue-biased genes in male flowers at

anthesis (M2TGs) was 1,040 higher than that in male floral buds (M1TGs: n = 1,755,

Fig. 3A and 3B). However, in female plants, the number (F2TGs: n = 660) of tissue-

biased genes in female flowers at anthesis (F2TGs) was only 536 more than that in

female floral buds (F1TGs: n = 124, Fig. 3C and 3D). Our results indicated that males

had a higher tissue-bias relative to females. We also identified sex-biased genes that

were expressed in both types of tissues by comparing tissue-biased genes with male-

biased and female-biased genes, respectively. Few female-biased genes in floral buds

(F1BGs: n = 5,096) overlapped with tissue-biased genes in female floral buds

(F1TGs: n = 124) and female flowers at anthesis (F2TGs: n = 660), accounting for

only 85 out of 5,096 (1.67%) (Fig. 3C). Similarly, few female-biased genes in flowers

at anthesis (F2BGs: n = 380) overlapped with tissue-biased genes in female floral

buds (F1TGs: n = 124) and female flowers at anthesis (F2TGs: n = 660), occupying

around 5 out of 380 (1.32%) (Fig. 3D). However, a significant proportion of male-

biased genes in floral buds (M1BGs: n = 4,214) overlapped with tissue-biased genes

in male floral buds (M1TGs: n = 1,755) and male flowers at anthesis (M2TGs: n =

2,795), with 1,010 out of 4,214 (23.97%) (Fig. 3A). A high proportion of male-biased

genes in flowers at anthesis (M2BGs: n = 233) overlapped with tissue-biased genes in

male floral buds (M1TGs: n = 1,755) and male flowers at anthesis (M2TGs: n =

2,795), 145 out of 233 (62.23%) (Fig. 3B).

Elevated protein evolutionary rates of male-biased genes in floral buds

We compared rates of protein evolution among male-biased, female-biased and

unbiased genes in four species with phylogenetic relationships ((($T. anguina$, $T.$

$pilosa$), $T. kirilowii$), $Luffa cylindrica$), including dioecious $T. pilosa$, dioecious $T.$

$kirilowii$, monoecious $T. anguina$ in $Trichosanthes$, together with monoecious $Luffa$

$cylindrica$. To do this, we sequenced transcriptomes of $T. pilosa.$ We also collected

transcriptomes of $T. kirilowii$, as well as genomes of $T. anguina$ and $Luffa cylindrica$

(see Methods Section). We identified 1,145 female-biased, 343 male-biased, and

2,378 unbiased one-to-one orthologous groups (OGs) from floral buds. Additionally,

we detected 45 female-biased, 13 male-biased, and 3,782 unbiased one-to-one OGs

from mature flowers in all four species. To quantify the rates of protein sequences, we

separately calculated ω values for each sex-biased and unbiased orthologous gene

using 'two-ratio' and 'free-ratio' branch models in juvenile and mature flowers (Figs.

4 and S2).

The two-ratio branch model, where the foreground (dioecious branches) has a

different ω value relative to the background (all other branches), is better supported

than the fixed-ratio branch model, where all branches are constrained to have the

same ω value. In the results of the 'two-ratio' branch model, the median of ω values in

female-biased, male-biased and unbiased genes were 0.227, 0.257 and 0.230 in floral

buds, respectively (Fig. 4A and Table S4). We observed that male-biased genes had a

13.22% and 11.74% higher median than female-biased and unbiased genes in floral

buds, respectively. The difference in the distribution of ω values between female-

biased versus male-biased genes ($P = 0.0021$) and male-biased versus unbiased genes

($P = 0.0051$) was statistically significant in Wilcoxon rank sum tests. However, we

did not find a significant difference in ω values between female-biased and unbiased

genes in floral buds (Wilcoxon rank sum test, $P = 0.4618$). In flowers at anthesis, the

median of ω values for female-biased, male-biased, and unbiased genes were 0.269,

0.177 and 0.231, respectively (Fig. 4B and Table S4). However, there was no

statistically significant difference in the distribution of ω values using Wilcoxon rank

sum tests for female-biased versus male-biased genes ($P = 0.0556$), female-biased

versus unbiased genes ($P = 0.0796$), and male-biased versus unbiased genes ($P =$

0.3296) possibly because of limited statistical power due to the low number of sex-

biased genes in flowers at anthesis.

In free-ratios model, ω values are free to vary in each branch compared to fixed-

ratio branch model and two-ratio branch model. The 'free-ratio' branch model yielded

interesting results. In floral buds, the median ω values for female-biased, male-biased,

and unbiased genes were 0.222, 0.265 and 0.226, respectively (Fig. 4C and Table S5).

Male-biased genes had a significantly higher median relative to female-biased genes

(19.37% higher, Wilcoxon rank sum test, $P = 0.0009$) and unbiased genes (17.26%

higher, Wilcoxon rank sum test, $P = 0.0004$) in floral buds. However, there was no

significant difference in ω values between female-biased and unbiased genes

(Wilcoxon rank sum test, $P = 0.9862$). In flowers at anthesis, the median ω values for

female-biased, male-biased, and unbiased genes were 0.300, 0.148 and 0.227,

respectively (Fig. 4D and Table S5). Female-biased and unbiased genes had

significantly higher ω values than male-biased (Wilcoxon rank sum test, $P = 0.0101$,

$P = 0.0146$, respectively). However, there was no significant difference in ω values

between female-biased and unbiased genes (Wilcoxon rank sum test, $P = 0.2887$).

Since the number of male-biased genes and evolutionary rates of male-biased genes in

flowers at anthesis are lower than those in floral buds, we decided to focus on the

latter in subsequent analyses. Additionally, we also ran permutation t test, which is

almost consistent with the results of Wilcoxon rank sum test. We found that only in

floral buds, there were significant differences in ω values in the results of 'free-ratio'

model (female-biased versus male-biased genes, $P = 0.04282$ and male-biased versus

unbiased genes, $P = 0.01114$) and 'two-ratio' model (female-biased versus male-

biased genes, $P = 0.01992$ and male-biased versus unbiased genes, $P = 0.02127$,

respectively).

Evidence of positive selection and relaxed selection for male-biased genes in

floral buds

After comparing classical branch-site model A and branch-site model null

models (see Methods Section), we discovered that 39 out of 343 OGs (11.34%) in

male-biased genes of floral buds exhibited strong evidence of having certain sites that

evolved under positive selection based on foreground ω value, likelihood ratio tests

(LRTs, $P < 0.05$) and Bayes empirical Bayes (BEB) value (Fig. 5 and Table S6). As a

complementary approach, we utilized the aBSREL and BUSTED methods that are

implemented in HyPhy v.2.5 software, which avoids false positive results by classical

branch-site models due to the presence of rate variation in background branches, and

detected significant evidence of positive selection. According to our findings, 84 out

of 343 OGs (24.49%) were identified to be under episodic positive selection in male-

biased genes of floral buds with a site proportion of 0.17%–26.44% based on aBSREL

(Table S7). In addition, 69 out of 343 OGs (20.01%) exhibited significant signs of

positive selection with the site proportion of 0.28%–32.65% in male-biased genes of

floral buds according to BUSTED (Table S8). Among these, a total of 32 OGs

(9.30%) were identified through our tests using CodeML, aBSREL and BUSTED

(Fig. 5).

 Relaxed selection may occur when the efficiency of natural selection (e.g., the

reduction of the strength of purifying selection) is reduced, leading to accumulations

of deleterious mutations (Lahti et al., 2009; Dapper and Wade, 2020). This has been

proposed as an explanation for the rapid evolution of sex-biased genes (Lahti et al.,

2009; Mank, 2017). Using the RELAX model, we conducted an analysis and detected

that 18 out of 343 OGs (5.23%) showed significant evidence of relaxed selection (K =

0.0184–0.6497) (Tables S9). We also found that most of them were members of

different gene families generated by gene duplication (Table S13). Additionally, we

observed that 61 out of 343 OGs (17.73%) exhibited significant evidence of

intensified positive selection (K = 2.3363–50, $\omega_2 \geq 1$) (Fig. 5 and Table S10), which is

consistent with the results obtained from CodeML, aBSREL and BUSTED.

According to previous studies (Ellegren and Parsch, 2007; Catalan et al., 2018),

genes that exhibit sex-biased expression with rapid evolutionary rates tend to display

a lower codon bias compared to unbiased genes. In our results, we found that male-

biased genes in floral buds had a significantly lower median effective number of

codons (ENCs) than both female-biased and unbiased genes (Wilcoxon rank sum test,

female-biased vs male-biased genes, $P = 0.0001$ and male-biased vs unbiased genes,

$P = 0.0123$). This suggested that male-biased genes in floral buds exhibit stronger

codon bias than both female-biased and unbiased genes (Fig. S3). Similarly, given

that d_N/d_S values of sex-biased genes were higher due to codon usage bias, lower d_S

rates would be expected in sex-biased genes relative to unbiased genes (Ellegren &

Parsch, 2007; Parvathy et al., 2022). However, we exhibited that the median of d_S

values in male-biased genes were much higher than those in female-biased and

unbiased genes in the results of 'free-ratio' (Fig. S4A, female-biased versus male-

biased genes, $P = 6.444e-12$ and male-biased versus unbiased genes, $P = 4.564e-13$)

and 'two-ratio' model (Fig. S4B, female-biased versus male-biased genes, $P = 2.2e-16$

and male-biased versus unbiased genes, $P = 9.421e-08$, respectively). In short, our

analyses indicated that rapid evolutionary rates of male-biased genes in floral buds

were not associated with a reduction in codon usage bias.

We also analyzed female-biased and unbiased genes that underwent positive and

relaxed selection in floral buds (Tables S6-S10). We identified 216 (18.86%)

positively selected (Fig. S5), and 69 (6.03%) relaxed selective female-biased genes

from 1,145 OGs, respectively. Similarly, we found 436 (18.33%) positively selected

(Fig. S6), and 43 (1.81%) unbiased genes under relaxed selection from 2,378 OGs,

respectively. Notably, male-biased genes have a higher proportion (10%) of positively

selected genes compared to female-biased and unbiased genes. However, relaxed

selective male-biased genes have a higher proportion (3.24%) than unbiased genes,

but about 0.8% lower than that of female-biased genes. In summary, our analyses

suggested that positive selection and relaxed selection likely drove the rapid

evolutionary rates of male-biased genes compared to female-biased and unbiased

genes in floral buds.

Functional analysis of sex-biased genes in floral buds

We conducted KEGG pathway enrichment analysis on sex-biased genes in floral

buds. Our results showed that 699 genes were female-biased and 358 genes were

male-biased, with significant enrichment ($P < 0.05$) in 26 and 24 KEGG pathways,

respectively (Table S11). In the floral bud stage, we observed that female-biased

genes were mainly enriched in metabolic and signaling pathways, such as ribosome,

Fatty acid elongation, photosynthesis and plant hormone signal transduction (Fig. S7A

and Table S11). On the other hand, male-biased genes were significantly enriched in

metabolic and signaling pathways, including inositol phosphate metabolism, starch

and sucrose metabolism, regulation of autophagy, plant hormone signal transduction,

and Toll-like receptor signaling pathway (Fig. S7B and Table S11).

We have also found that certain male-biased genes, which are evolving under

positive selection and relaxed selection (Table S12 and S13), were related to abiotic

stress and immune responses. For instance, mitogen-activated protein kinase kinase

kinase 18 (MAPKKK18) (Zhang and Zhang, 2022), zinc finger CCCH domain-

containing protein 20 (C3H20/TZF2) (Bogamuwa and Jang, 2014), and heat stress

transcription factor B-3 (HSFB3) (Scharf et al., 2012) have been linked to stress.

Additionally, ten male-biased genes with rapid evolutionary rates were associated

with anther and pollen development. These genes include LRR receptor-like

serine/threonine protein kinase (LRR-RLK) (Cui et al., 2022), pollen receptor-like

kinase 3 (*PRK3*) (Muschietti and Wengier, 2018), autophagy-related protein 18f

(*ATG18f*) (Zhou et al., 2015; Li et al., 2020), and plant homeodomain (PHD) finger

protein 3 (*MALE STERILITY 3*) (Hou et al., 2022) in floral buds of male plants.

Discussion

The Cucurbitaceae family, where half of the species are monoecious and half are

dioecious, is an excellent model for studying the evolution of sexual systems of

angiosperms, including sex-determination mechanism and sexual dimorphism

(Schaefer and Renner, 2010; Boualem et al., 2015; Ma and Pannell, 2016). In this

study, we aimed to investigate whether sex-biased genes exhibited evidence of rapid

evolutionary rates of protein sequences and identify the evolutionary forces

responsible for the observed patterns in the dioecious *Trichosanthes pilosa*. We

compared the expression profiles of sex-biased genes between sexes and two tissue

types and examined the signatures of rapid sequence evolution for sex-biased genes,

as well as the contributions of potential evolutionary forces.

Sex-biased expression in floral buds

Several studies have shown that in dioecious plants, male-biased genes tend to

outnumber female-biased genes, consistent with the patterns in most animals (Zhang

et al., 2007; Djordjevic et al., 2022). For instance, insect-pollinated dioecious plants

such as *Asparagus officinalis* (Harkess et al., 2015) and *Silene latifolia* (Zemp et al.,

2016), exhibit a higher proportion of male-biased genes. In contrast, the wind-

pollinated dioecious plant *Populus balsamifera* (Sanderson et al., 2019) has twice as

many female-biased genes as male-biased genes. The differences in these studies

could be partly attributed to the impact of sexual selection on secondary sexual traits

in insect-pollinated dioecious plants, as opposed to wind-pollinated ones (Delph and

Herlihy, 2012; Muyle, 2019; Sanderson et al., 2019). Similar to the above study of

Populus balsamifera, our findings revealed that the number of female-biased genes in

floral buds of the night-flowering, insect-pollinated dioecious plant *Trichosanthes*

pilosa exceeded that of male-biased genes by 882 (~21%). This excess of female-

biased expression could be due to lower energy consumption needs and reduced

chemical defence capability against insect herbivores in short-lived male flowers

(Sanderson et al., 2019). Indeed, functional enrichment analysis in chemical pathways

such as terpenoid backbone and diterpenoid biosynthesis indicated that relative to

male floral buds, female floral buds had more expressed genes that were equipped to

defend against herbivorous insects and pathogens, except for growth and development

(Vaughan et al., 2013; Ren et al., 2022) (Fig. S7A and Table S11). Additionally, our

enrichment analysis showed that the photosynthesis, porphyrin and chlorophyll

metabolism pathways were more active in female floral buds compared to male floral

buds (Fig. S7A and Table S11), enabling them to acquire more resources such as

carbon for fruit and seed production (Delph,1999).

We identified functional enrichments in Toll-like receptor signaling, NF-kappa B

signaling, and inositol phosphate metabolism pathways in male floral buds (Fig. S7B,

Table S11). We also found that male-biased genes with high evolutionary rates in male

floral buds were associated with functions to abiotic stresses and immune responses

(Tables S12 and S13), which suggest that male floral buds through rapidly evolving

genes are adapted to mountain climate and the environment in Southwest China

relative to female floral buds through high gene expression. In addition, the

enrichment in regulation of autophagy pathways could be associated with gamete

development and the senescence of male floral buds (Table S14) (Liu and Bassham,

2012; Li et al., 2020; Zhou et al., 2021). In fact, it was observed that male flowers

senesced faster (Wu et al., 2011). We also found that homologous genes of two male-

biased genes in floral buds (Table S14) that control the raceme inflorescence

development (Teo et al., 2014) were highly expressed compared to female floral buds.

Taken together, these results indicate that expression changes in sex-biased genes,

rather than sex-specific genes play different roles in sexual dimorphic traits in

physiology and morphology (Dawson and Geber, 1999).

Rapid Evolution of male-biased genes in floral buds

It has been observed that, in most animals, sex-biased genes, particularly those

biased towards males, often exhibit more rapid evolutionary rates than unbiased genes

(Parsch and Ellegren, 2013; Grath and Parsch, 2016; Mank, 2017; Toubiana et al.,

2021). However, in dioecious angiosperms, no evidence of rapid evolution in sex-

biased genes relative to unbiased genes has been found (Zemp et al., 2016; Darolti et

al., 2018; Cossard et al., 2019; Sanderson et al., 2019; Scharmann et al., 2021). In

contrast, our findings indicated that male-biased genes experience higher evolutionary

rates than both female-biased and unbiased genes in floral buds of dioecious *T. pilosa.*

We proposed that positive selection and relaxed purifying selection may be

responsible for the rapid sequence evolution of male-biased genes.

After analyzing the data, we found that around 28.57% (98 genes) of male-biased

genes have undergone positive selection. Additionally, we observed that the

proportion of male-biased genes under positive selection was about 10% higher than

that of female-biased and unbiased genes. Furthermore, we discovered that some

male-biased genes under positive selection were linked to abiotic stress and immune

responses (Table S12). Our findings are consistent with studies on *Drosophila* and

Ectocarpus (Zhang and Parsch, 2005; Lipinska et al., 2015), suggesting that adaptive

evolution is one of the important driving forces for rapid evolutionary rates. Notably,

we identified several male-biased genes under positive selection that are functionally

related to early flowering (*phyB*) (Stephenson and Bertin, 1983; Forrest, 2014; Hajdu

et al., 2015) and pollen development (Skogsmyr and Lankinen, 2002; Williams and

Reese, 2019) (Tables S12-S14). These findings indicate that a small fraction of male-biased genes may experience adaptive evolution due to sexual selection, driven by male-male competition.

Alternatively, relaxed constraints could contribute to the rapid evolutionary rates of sex-biased genes through three key characteristics (Dapper and Wade, 2020; Tosto et al., 2023). First, sex-biased genes are often expressed solely in reproductive tissues of one sex (e.g., sex-specific genes), particularly in the haploid phase (Sandler et al., 2018; Immler, 2019; Beaudry et al., 2020). Sex-specific selection (e.g., relaxed purifying selection) acting on sex-specific genes could decrease the elimination of deleterious mutations (Mank, 2017), such as pollen-specific (Harrison et al., 2019) or testes-specific genes (Gershoni and Pietrokovski, 2014). However, we observed male-biased genes but not male-specific genes undergoing relaxed purifying selection. Second, sex-biased genes are often expressed in few tissues (tissue-biased genes) (Meisel, 2011; Tosto et al., 2023), resulting in these genes rapidly evolving under positive selection or relaxed purifying selection due to low evolutionary constraints (Congrains et al., 2018; Whittle et al., 2021; Tosto et al., 2023). In our results, 343 male-biased genes (M1-biased genes, M1BGs) with faster evolutionary rates relative to female-biased and unbiased genes overlapped with 1,755 tissue-biased genes in floral buds (M1-tissue-biased genes, M1TGs) (27 out of 343, 7.87%) (Fig. S8A). Furthermore, 27 out of 343 male-biased genes (that is, tissue-biased genes) in floral buds overlapped with nine out of 98 (9.18%) male-biased genes under positive selection (Fig. S8B), and one out of 18 (5.56%) male-biased genes under relaxed

purifying selection (Fig. S8C). So, we obtained ten rapidly evolving tissue-biased

genes which were also male-biased in male flower buds, suggesting that elevated

evolutionary rates may partly be linked to low constraints, consistent with male-

biased genes in *Anastrepha* and *Fucus* (Congrains et al., 2018; Hatchett et al., 2023).

Finally, gene duplication has long been thought to promote functional divergences and

phenotypic novelties by relaxing the constraints of purifying selection on the

duplicated gene copy early in its history (Lynch and Conery, 2000; Lynch and Katju,

2004; Lahti et al., 2009). For instance, the progesterone receptor gene family in the

human lineage (Marinić and Lynch, 2020) and the CYP98A9 clade in Brassicales (Liu

et al., 2016) have demonstrated rapid evolution and divergent function due to relaxed

purifying selection. In our results, we identified 18 out of 343 (5.25%) male-biased

genes that underwent relaxed purifying selection using RELAX model (Table S13).

Interestingly, the vast majority of genes under relaxed selection were members of

different gene families generated by gene duplication (including whole-genome

duplication), such as LOB domain-containing protein 18 (*LBD18*) (Zhang et al.,

2020), WRKY transcription factor 72 (*WRKY72*) (Chen et al., 2017), and pollen

receptor-like kinase 3 (*PRK3*) (Muschietti and Wengier, 2018).

Additionally, reducing codon usage bias could theoretically accelerate

evolutionary rates of sex-biased genes by decreasing synonymous substitution rates.

However, our results did not support this idea due to stronger codon usage bias in

male-biased genes (Fig. S3). Codon usage bias is influenced by many factors, such as

levels of gene expression. Highly expressed genes have a stronger codon usage bias

and could be encoded by optimal codons for more efficient translation (Frumkin et al., 2018; Parvathy et al., 2022), consistent with high levels of gene expression in males (that is, male-biased genes) in floral buds. Additionally, stronger codon usage bias may be related to higher synonymous substitution rates (Parvathy et al., 2022). Indeed, male-biased genes had significantly higher median d_S values than female-biased and unbiased genes, both in the 'free-ratio' analysis (Fig. S4A) and 'two-ratio' branch model (Fig. S4B).

Several species have been observed to exhibit rapid evolutionary rates of sequences on sex chromosomes compared to autosomes, which has been related to the evolutionary theories of fast-X or fast-Z (Meisel and Connallon, 2013; Hough et al., 2014; Wright et al., 2015; Charlesworth et al., 2018; Darolti et al., 2023). Furthermore, the quantification of gene expression by bulk RNA-seq technology, relative to single-cell transcriptome analysis, has been shown to potentially obfuscate true signals in the evolution of sex-biased gene expression in complex aggregations of diverse cell types (Darolti and Mank, 2023; Tosto et al., 2023). Additionally, our samples were relatively small, and may provide low power to detect differential expression and evolutionary analysis. Therefore, investigation of these interesting issues related to sex-biased gene evolution in *T. pilosa* can only be conducted when whole genome sequences and population datasets become available in the near future.

Methods

Plant materials and RNA isolation

Floral buds (≤ 3 mm) and flowers at anthesis were sampled from three female and three male plants (Fig. 1) from the mountainous regions of Anning (Qinglong Gorge), Yunnan Province in Southwest China. Floral buds from female and male plants were named F1 and M1, respectively. Similarly, flowers at anthesis from female and male plants, there were named F2 and M2, respectively (Table S1). To exclude possible bacterial contamination, all tissues were sterilized with 75% alcohol and immediately rinsed with purified water. All samples were then snap-frozen in liquid nitrogen, and stored at -80°C. Total RNA was extracted from each sample using TRIzol reagent (Life Technologies, CA, USA) according to the manufacturer's instructions. The quantification and qualification of RNA were assessed by the RNA Nano 6000 Assay Kit of the Bioanalyzer 2100 system (Agilent Technologies, CA, USA).

Illumina sequencing, *de novo* assembly and annotation

To construct the library, approximately 2 μg of total RNA was used with the Illumina NEBNext UltraTM RNA Library Prep Kit. RNA sequencing was performed on the Illumina NovaSeq 6000, generating 150 bp paired-end reads. The resulting clean reads were obtained by removing adapters, reads containing N bases and low-quality reads using Trimmomatic v.0.39 (Bolger et al., 2014). These reads were

deposited in the NCBI database (PRJNA899312).

De novo assembly for clean reads from all samples was performed using Trinity

v.2.10.0 (Haas et al., 2013) with min_kmer_cov: 3 and all other default parameters. To

eliminate contamination, all transcripts of *de novo* assembly were compared to

bacterial genomes downloaded from NCBI databases using BLASTN with e-value of

1.0e-05 in blast+ 2.12.0 software. We used Corset v.4.6 (Davidson and Oshlack, 2014)

to obtain high quality, non-redundant consensus transcripts (unigenes). TransDecoder

v.5.5.0 was run with -m 100 parameters, namely at least 100 amino acids, to predict

the coding DNA and protein sequences (Haas et al., 2013).

To evaluate the accuracy and completeness of reference transcriptomes, we

performed gene function annotations based on the following databases, using BLAST

with a cutoff e-value of 1.0e-05: NR, NT and Swissport (Shiryev et al., 2007). We

mapped the unigenes to Pfam database using InterProScan v.5.41 (Jones et al., 2014),

to the GO database using Blast2GO (Conesa et al., 2005), and to the KEGG database

using KEGG automatic annotation server (Moriya et al., 2007). Additionally, we

estimated the completeness of reference transcriptomes using BUSCO v.5.4.5 based

on embryophyta_odb10 database (Seppey et al., 2019).

Detection of sex-biased genes

Clean reads were mapped onto all unigenes using Bowtie2 (Langmead and

Salzberg, 2012). Read counts were normalized to FPKM (Fragments Per Kilobase

Million) value for each unigene using RSEM (Li and Dewey, 2011) in different male

and female samples. Genes with zero read counts (i.e., no expression) in both two

sexes and tissues were excluded. Differential expression analysis between sexes and

tissue types was performed using DESeq2 R package (Love et al., 2014). Unigenes

with an FDR-adjusted $P < 0.05$ and an absolute value of $\log_2$ ratio ≥ 1 identified by

DESeq2 were considered as sex-biased genes. To perform KEGG functional

enrichment, we used all KEGG annotation terms for all genes as the background and

performed the analyses using KOBAS v.2.0.12 (Mao et al., 2005).

Evolutionary rate analyses

To quantify the evolutionary rates of sex-biased genes, we download published

genome datasets for monoecious *Trichosanthes anguina* (Ma et al., 2020) and

monoecious *Luffa cylindrica* which has a closer phylogenetic relationship with

Trichosanthes (de Boer et al., 2012; Wu et al., 2020) from CuGenDB database (Zheng

et al., 2019). Additionally, we also download published RNA sequencing reads of

floral buds and flowers from CNCB (Accession CRA002313) and NCBI databases

(Accession SRR5259239) for dioecious plant *Trichosanthes kirilowii* (Hu et al.,

2020), and *de novo* assembled by previously described methods.

We identified one-to-one OGs using OrthoFinder v.2.3.3 with default parameters

from *T. anguina*, *T. pilosa*, *T. kirilowii*, and *Luffa cylindrica* (Emms and Kelly, 2019).

Then, we employed TranslatorX with -c 1 -p M -g -b5 n parameters (i.e., the multiple

alignment and the trimming using Muscle and GBlocks, respectively), translated

nucleotide sequences and back-translated amino acid alignments into nucleotide

alignments to ensure codon-to-codon alignment (Abascal et al., 2010). The remaining

gapless alignments (≥100 bp in length) were retained.

To investigate the evolutionary rates of coding sequences, we estimated

nonsynonymous substitution (d_N), synonymous substitution (d_S) rates, as well as

protein substitution rates (d_N/d_S, ω), using two branch models from CodeML package

in PAML v.4.9h with the F3x4 codon frequencies (CodonFreq = 2) (Yang, 2007).

According to the phylogenetic relationships of *Trichosanthes* (de Boer et al., 2012;

Guo et al., 2020), we set up tree structures ((*T. anguina*, *T. pilosa*), *T. kirilowii*, *L.*

cylindrica) in the control file of CodeML. First, we employed a 'two-ratio' branch

model (model = 2, Nssites = 0) that assumes the foreground (two dioecious species)

has a different ω value from the background (two monoecious species) to estimate and

compare the divergences of the foreground. Second, to reduce the potential bias of ω

value due to the conflation of two dioecious species, we also implemented a 'free-

ratio' branch model (model = 1, Nssites = 0), which assumes an independent ω ratio

for each branch. Finally, to avoid the effects of saturation substitution, we used

separately OGs with 0 < ω < 2 and all OGs with ω > 0, plotted the distribution of ω

values and compared the median of ω values in female-biased, male-biased and

unbiased orthologous genes of floral buds and flowers at anthesis. All comparisons

between sex-biased and unbiased genes were tested using Wilcoxon rank sum test in

R software. Additionally, we also performed permutations t-tests with 100,000

permutations in the R package Deducer (Fellows, 2012).

Estimation of the strength of natural selection

The rapid evolutionary rates of sex-biased genes may be attributed to positive

selection, relaxed selection and lower codon usage bias (Catalan et al., 2018; Dapper

and Wade, 2020). Therefore, we conducted separate analyses using classical branch-

site models that assume different ω values both among branches and across sites

(Álvarez-Carretero et al., 2023), the adaptive branch-site random effects likelihood

(aBSREL) model (Smith et al., 2015), the branch-site unrestricted statistical test for

episodic diversification (BUSTED) model (Murrell et al., 2015), the RELAX model

(Wertheim et al., 2015), and the effective number of codons (ENC) in PAML v.4.9h

(Yang, 2007), HyPhy v.2.5 (Pond et al., 2020) and CodonW v.1.4.2

(http://codonw.sourceforge.net) to distinguish which evolutionary forces are driving

the rapid evolutionary rates of sex-biased genes.

To determine if amino acid sites in the foreground, including the *T. pilosa* lineage

have undergone positive selection (foreground ω >1) compared with the background

for each OGs, we followed the steps of Zhang et al. (2005), and used branch-site

model A (model = 2, Nssite = 2, fix_omega = 0, omega = 1.5) and branch-site model

null (model = 2, Nssite = 2, fix_omega = 1, omega = 1). The classical branch-site

model assumes four site classes (0, 1, 2a, 2b), with different ω values for the

foreground and background branches. In site classes 2a and 2b, the foreground branch

undergoes positive selection when there is ω > 1. We examined the significance of

likelihood ratio tests (LRTs, $P < 0.05$) to identify positively selected sites between

model A and model null by comparing LRTs to the Chi-square distribution with two

degrees of freedom. We adjusted the LRTs *P* value for multiple comparisons using

Benjamini and Hochberg's (FDR) algorithm. When the *P* value was significant, we

used Bayes Empirical Bayes (BEB) estimates to identify sites with a high posterior

probability (pp ≥ 0.95) of being under positive selection (Yang et al., 2005).

To detect episodic positive selection at a proportion of sites on the foreground

branch, we employed the aBSREL method (Smith et al., 2015) in the HyPhy v.2.5

packages to compare the fully adaptive model ($\omega > 1$) to the null model that allows no

positive selection rate classes by LRTs, which is an improved algorithm of branch-site

models in PAML. For relatively small datasets, such as those with fewer than 10 taxa,

the aBSREL method may not have enough power to detect positive selection.

Therefore, we also ran the BUSTED method to identify gene-wide evidence of

episodic positive selection at least one site on at least one branch (Murrell et al.,

2015). We set *T. pilosa* as the foreground and assessed the statistical significance ($P <$

0.05) using LRTs with the Holm-Bonferroni correction.

To test the relaxation of selective strength, we utilized the RELAX model in the

HyPhy v.2.5 software (Wertheim et al., 2015; Schrader et al., 2021). The RELAX

model estimates three ω parameters ($\omega_0 \leq \omega_1 \leq 1 \leq \omega_2$), and determines the proportion

of sites in the test (foreground) and reference (background) branches using a branch-

site model. The first two ω classifications indicate that sites have undergone purifying

selection, and the third classification indicates that sites have been under positive

selection. Additionally, the model introduces a selection intensity parameter (K value)

to compare a null model (K = 1) with an alternative model, thereby assessing the

strength of natural selection. When K > 1, it suggests intensified natural selection,

when K < 1, indicates relaxed natural selection in the test branch relative to the

reference branch. We quantified the statistical confidence of K value ($P < 0.05$) using

LRTs and the Holm-Bonferroni correction.

To investigate codon usage bias, which refers to the differences in the frequency

of occurrence of synonymous codons in coding DNA, we employed CodonW v.1.4.2.

This program considers the ENC values from 20 to 61 as a measure of the departure

of the genetic codes for a given gene (Wright, 1990), with lower ENC values

represent stronger codon usage bias (Hambuch and Parsch, 2005). We performed a

Wilcoxon rank sum test to determine if there were deviations in ENC values among

female-biased, male-biased, and unbiased genes in floral buds.

Acknowledgements

We are very grateful to Spencer C. H. Barrett (University of Toronto, Canada) for

his critical reading and suggestions on the manuscript. We also thank three

anonymous reviewers for their comments on improving the quality of the manuscript.

We are indebted to Ting Zhang, Zhi-Yun Yang, Jiang-Li Ma, Peng-Fei Ma, Xu-Kun

Wu, Shi-Yu Lv, Zhen Peng and other members of staff of Germplasm Bank of Wild

Species for sampling. We also thank the iFlora HPC Center (iFlora High Performance

Computing Center) of Germplasm Bank of Wild Species for computational support on

data analysis.

Funding

This study was funded by the Strategic Priority Research Program of the Chinese Academy of Sciences, China (XDB31000000), the National Natural Science Foundation of China (32370233, 31570333), the Key R and D Program of Yunnan Province, China (202103AC100003), the Key Basic Research Program of Yunnan Province, China (202101BC070003), the Science and Technology Basic Resources Investigation Program of China (2019FY100900), and the open research project of "Cross-Cooperative Team" of the CAS' Germplasm Bank of Wild Species, Kunming Institute of Botany. The study was also supported by the National Wild Plant Germplasm Resource Center and the CAS Key Technology Talent Program.

Author contributions

HTL, DZL and LZ conceived the project the study. HTL and LZ designed and performed the experiment. LZ, JH and HTL collected the samples. LZ analyzed the data and wrote the manuscript. HTL, DZL, LZ, and WZ revised the manuscript. All authors approved the final manuscript.

Additional files

Supplementary files

Supplementary file 1. Supplementary Figures S1 to S8.

Supplementary Figure S1. The length distribution of unigenes (A) and the e-value distribution (B) and the species distribution (C) of BLAST hits for each unigene.

Supplementary Figure S2. Boxplot of d_N/d_S values (including all ω values) of female-biased, male-biased and unbiased genes in floral buds and flowers at anthesis of *Trichosanthes pilosa*. White dot indicates the median of dN/dS values for sex-biased and unbiased genes. Wilcoxon rank sum tests are used to test for significant differences (***$P < 0.0005$, **$P < 0.005$ and *$P < 0.05$). The distributions of d_N/d_S values for female-biased, male-biased and unbiased genes in floral buds (A) and flowers at anthesis (B) using 'free-ratio' branch model. The distributions of d_N/d_S values for female-biased, male-biased and unbiased genes in floral buds (C) and flowers at anthesis (D) using 'two-ratio' branch model.

Supplementary Figure S3. Violin plots of ENCs values of female-biased, male-biased and unbiased genes in floral buds. Significant differences using Wilcoxon rank sum tests are represented by * (***$P < 0.0005$ and *$P < 0.05$).

Supplementary Figure S4. Boxplot of d_S values of female-biased, male-biased and unbiased genes in floral buds of dioecious *Trichosanthes pilosa* using 'free-ratio' (A) and 'two-ratio' (B) branch model. Significant differences are represented by * in Wilcoxon rank sum tests (***$P < 0.0005$).

Supplementary Figure S5. Venn diagrams of female-biased genes under positive selection in floral buds. Overlaps of female-biased genes were detected to be under positive selection using aBSREL, BUSTED, CodeML and RELAX.

Supplementary Figure S6. Venn diagrams of unbiased genes under positive selection in floral buds. Overlaps of unbiased genes were identified to be under positive selection using aBSREL, BUSTED, CodeML and RELAX.

Supplementary Figure S7. Scatterplots of KEGG pathway of sex-biased genes in

female (A) and male (B) floral buds of the dioecious *Trichosanthes pilosa*. The y

axis represents the pathway name, and the x axis represents the ratio of genes

corresponding to the pathways.

Supplementary Figure S8. The overlap between male-biased genes with faster

evolutionary rates and tissue-biased genes in floral buds. M1BGs indicate male-

biased genes with faster evolutionary rates in male floral buds (M1-biased genes).

M1TGs indicate tissue-biased genes in male floral buds (M1-tissue-biased genes).

343 M1BGs overlapped with 1755 M1TGs (A). 27 out of 343 M1BGs&M1TGs

overlapped with M1BGs_98 (B). 27 out of 343 M1BGs&M1TGs overlapped

with M1BGs_18 (C).

Supplementary file 2. Supplementary Tables S1 to S14.

Supplementary Table S1. Overview of sequencing reads from 12 samples of male

and female plants in *Trichosanthes pilosa*.

Supplementary Table S2. Numbers of unigenes annotated in public databases.

Supplementary Table S3. The mapping rate of reads for each sample in floral

buds and flowers at anthesis of *Trichosanthes pilosa*.

Supplementary Table S4. d_N, d_S and ω values of each female-biased, male-biased,

unbiased orthologous genes of floral buds and flowers at anthesis for each species

using 'two-ratio' branch model of CodeML in PAML. Two dioecious species

Trichosanthes pilosa and *T. kirilowii* represent the foreground and two

monoecious species *T. anguina* and *Luffa cylindrica* represent the background.

Supplementary Table S5. d_N, d_S and ω values of each female-biased, male-biased,

unbiased orthologous genes of floral buds and flowers at anthesis for each species

using 'free-ratio' branch model of CodeML in PAML.

Supplementary Table S6. Genes under positive selection identified by branch-site

model of CodeML in PAML and function in NR, KEGG, Swissport and GO

databases for male-biased orthologous genes in floral buds. Two dioecious

species *Trichosanthes pilosa* and *T. kirilowii* represent the foreground and two

monoecious species, *T. anguina* and *Luffa cylindrica* represent the background.

Supplementary Table S7. Genes under episodic positive selection tested by

aBSREL model in HyPhy and functions in NR, KEGG, Swissport and GO

databases for male-biased orthologous genes in floral buds. The dioecious species

Trichosanthes pilosa represents the foreground and other species represent the

background.

Supplementary Table S8. Genes under episodic positive selection found by

BUSTED model in HyPhy and functions in NR, KEGG, Swissport and GO

databases for male-biased orthologous genes in floral buds. The dioecious species

Trichosanthes pilosa represents the foreground (unconstrained branch) and other

species represent the background (constrained branch).

Supplementary Table S9. Genes under relaxed selection detected by RELAX

model in HyPhy and functions in NR, KEGG, Swissport and GO databases for

male-biased orthologous genes in floral buds. The dioecious species

Trichosanthes pilosa represents the foreground (test) and other species represent

the background (reference).

Supplementary Table S10. Genes under intensified positive selection identified by

RELAX model in HyPhy and functions in NR, KEGG, Swissport and GO

databases for male-biased orthologous genes in floral buds. The dioecious species

Trichosanthes pilosa represents the foreground (test) and other species represent

the background (reference).

Supplementary Table S11. KEGG pathway enrichment analysis of female-biased

and male-biased genes in floral buds of the dioecious *Trichosanthes pilosa*.

Supplementary Table S12. Functions and references associated with abiotic stress

and immune responses, organ developments of male-biased genes under

significant positive selection ($P < 0.05$) in floral buds.

Supplementary Table S13. Functions and references associated with abiotic stress

and immune responses, organ developments of male-biased genes under

significant relaxed selection ($P < 0.05$) in floral buds.

Supplementary Table S14. The expressions and functions of some male-biased

genes associated with senescence, raceme inflorescence development and early

flowering in floral buds.

Data Availability

All RNA-Sequencing clean reads have been deposited in the databases of the

National Center for Biotechnology Information (NCBI) under BioProject ID

PRJNA899312. The reference transcriptome, orthology data, and alignments have

been uploaded to ResearchGate

(www.researchgate.net/publication/373194650_Trichosanthes_pilosa_datasets).

References

Abascal F, Zardoya R, Telford MJ. 2010. TranslatorX: multiple alignment of nucleotide sequences guided by amino acid translations. *Nucleic Acids Research* **38**: W7-13.

Álvarez-Carretero S, Kapli P, Yang Z. 2023. Beginner's guide on the use of PAML to detect positive selection. *Molecular Biology and Evolution* **40**: msad041.

Arunkumar R, Josephs EB, Williamson RJ, Wright SI. 2013. Pollen-specific, but not sperm-specific, genes show stronger purifying selection and higher rates of positive selection than sporophytic genes in *Capsella grandiflora*. *Molecular Biology and Evolution* **30**: 2475-2486.

Assis R, Zhou Q, Bachtrog D. 2012. Sex-biased transcriptome evolution in *Drosophila*. *Genome Biology and Evolution* **4**: 1189-1200.

Barrett SCH, Hough J. 2013. Sexual dimorphism in flowering plants. *Journal of Experimental Botany* **64**: 67-82.

Beaudry FEG, Rifkin JL, Barrett SCH, Wright SI. 2020. Evolutionary genomics of plant gametophytic selection. *Plant Communications* **1**: 100115.

Bogamuwa SP, Jang JC. 2014. Tandem CCCH zinc finger proteins in plant growth, development and stress response. *Plant and Cell Physiology* **55**: 1367-1375.

Bolger AM, Lohse M, Usadel B. 2014. Trimmomatic: a flexible trimmer for Illumina

sequence data. *Bioinformatics* **30**: 2114-2120.

Boualem A, Troadec C, Camps C, Lemhemdi A, Morin H, Sari M-A, Fraenkel-

Zagouri R, Kovalski I, Dogimont C, Perl-Treves R, Bendahmane A. 2015. A

cucurbit androecy gene reveals how unisexual flowers develop and dioecy

emerges. *Science* **350**: 688-691.

Cai ZY, Yang CC, Liao J, Song HF, Zhang S. 2021. Sex-biased genes and metabolites

explain morphologically sexual dimorphism and reproductive costs in *Salix*

paraplesia catkins. *Horticulture Research* **8**: 125.

Catalan A, Macias-Munoz A, Briscoe AD. 2018. Evolution of sex-biased gene

expression and dosage compensation in the eye and brain of *Heliconius*

Butterflies. *Molecular Biology and Evolution* **35**: 2343-2343.

Charlesworth B, Campos JL, Jackson BC. 2018. Faster-X evolution: theory and

evidence from *Drosophila*. *Molecular Ecology* **27**: 3753-3771.

Charlesworth D. 2018. Does sexual dimorphism in plants promote sex chromosome

evolution? *Environmental and Experimental Botany* **146**: 5-12.

Chen F, Hu Y, Vannozzi A, Wu K, Cai H, Qin Y, Mullis A, Lin Z, Zhang L. 2017. The

WRKY transcription factor family in model plants and crops. *Critical Reviews in*

Plant Sciences **36**: 311-335.

Conesa A, Gotz S, Garcia-Gomez JM, Terol J, Talon M, Robles M. 2005. Blast2GO:

a universal tool for annotation, visualization and analysis in functional

genomics research. *Bioinformatics* **21**: 3674-3676.

Congrains C, Campanini EB, Torres FR, Rezende VB, Nakamura AM, de Oliveira JL,

793 Lima ALA, Chahad-Ehlers S, Sobrinho IS, de Brito RA. 2018. Evidence of

794 adaptive evolution and relaxed constraints in sex-biased genes of South

795 American and West Indies fruit flies (Diptera: Tephritidae). *Genome Biology*

796 *and Evolution* **10**: 380-395.

797 **Cossard GG**, Godfroy O, Nehr Z, Cruaud C, Cock JM, Lipinska AP, Coelho SM.

798 2022. Selection drives convergent gene expression changes during transitions

799 to co-sexuality in haploid sexual systems. *Nature Ecology and Evolution* **6**:

800 579-589.

801 **Cossard GG**, Toups MA, Pannell JR. 2019. Sexual dimorphism and rapid turnover in

802 gene expression in pre-reproductive seedlings of a dioecious herb. *Annals of*

803 *Botany* **123**: 1119-1131.

804 **Cui YW**, Lu XT, Gou XP. 2022. Receptor-like protein kinases in plant reproduction:

805 current understanding and future perspectives. *Plant Communications* **3**:

806 100273.

807 **Dapper AL**, Wade MJ. 2020. Relaxed selection and the rapid evolution of

808 reproductive genes. *Trends in Genetics* **36**: 640-649.

809 **Darolti I**, Fong LJM, Sandkam BA, Metzger DCH, Mank JE. 2023. Sex chromosome

810 heteromorphism and the Fast-X effect in poeciliids. *Molecular ecology* **32**:

811 4599-4609.

812 **Darolti I**, Mank JE. 2023. Sex-biased gene expression at single-cell resolution: cause

813 and consequence of sexual dimorphism. *Evolution Letters* **7**: 148-156.

814 **Darolti I**, Wright AE, Pucholt P, Berlin S, Mank JE. 2018. Slow evolution of sex-

biased genes in the reproductive tissue of the dioecious plant *Salix viminalis*. *Molecular ecology* **27**: 694-708.

Davidson NM, Oshlack A. 2014. Corset: enabling differential gene expression analysis for *de novo* assembled transcriptomes. *Genome Biology* **15**: 410.

Dawson TE, Geber MA. 1999. Sexual dimorphism in physiology and morphology. In: Geber MA, Dawson TE, Delph LF (Eds). *Gender and Sexual Dimorphism in Flowering Plants*. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer. p. 175-215.

de Boer HJ, Schaefer H, Thulin M, Renner SS. 2012. Evolution and loss of long-fringed petals: a case study using a dated phylogeny of the snake gourds, *Trichosanthes* (Cucurbitaceae). *BMC Ecology and Evolution* **12**: 108.

de Boer HJ, Steffen K, Cooper WE. 2015. Sunda to Sahul dispersals in *Trichosanthes* (Cucurbitaceae): a dated phylogeny reveals five independent dispersal events to Australasia. *Journal of Biogeography* **42**: 519-531.

Delph LF. 1999. Sexual dimorphism in life history. In: Geber MA, Dawson TE, Delph LF (Eds). *Gender and Sexual Dimorphism in Flowering Plants*. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer. p. 149-173.

Delph LF, Herlihy CR. 2012. Sexual, fecundity, and viability selection on flower size and number in a sexually dimorphic plant. *Evolution* **66**: 1154-1166.

Djordjevic J, Dumas Z, Robinson-Rechavi M, Schwander T, Parker DJ. 2022. Dynamics of sex-biased gene expression during development in the stick insect *Timema californicum*. *Heredity* **129**: 113-122.

Ellegren H, Parsch J. 2007. The evolution of sex-biased genes and sex-biased gene

expression. *Nature Reviews Genetics* **8**: 689-698.

Emms DM, Kelly S. 2019. OrthoFinder: phylogenetic orthology inference for

comparative genomics. *Genome Biology* **20**: 238.

Fellows I. 2012. Deducer: a data analysis GUI for R. *Journal of Statistical Software*

49: 1-15.

Forrest JRK. 2014. Plant size, sexual selection, and the evolution of protandry in

dioecious plants. *American Naturalist* **184**: 338-351.

Frumkin I, Lajoie MJ, Gregg CJ, Hornung G, Church GM, Pilpel Y. 2018. Codon

usage of highly expressed genes affects proteome-wide translation efficiency.

Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences **115**: E4940-E4949.

Gershoni M, Pietrokovski S. 2014. Reduced selection and accumulation of

deleterious mutations in genes exclusively expressed in men. *Nature*

Communications **5**: 4438.

Gossmann TI, Schmid MW, Grossniklaus U, Schmid KJ. 2014. Selection-driven

evolution of sex-biased genes is consistent with sexual selection in

Arabidopsis thaliana. *Molecular Biology and Evolution* **31**: 574-583.

Gossmann TI, Saleh D, Schmid MW, Spence MA, Schmid KJ. 2016. Transcriptomes

of plant gametophytes have a higher proportion of rapidly evolving and young

genes than sporophytes. *Molecular Biology and Evolution* **33**: 1669-1678.

Grath S, Parsch J. 2016. Sex-biased gene expression. *Annual Review of Genetics* **50**:

29-44.

Guo J, Xu W, Hu Y, Huang J, Zhao Y, Zhang L, Huang CH, Ma H. 2020.

Phylotranscriptomics in Cucurbitaceae reveal multiple whole-genome

duplications and key morphological and molecular innovations. *Molecular*

Plant **13**: 1117-1133.

Gutierrez-Valencia J, Fracassetti M, Horvath R, Laenen B, Desamore A, Drouzas

AD, Friberg M, Kolar F, Slotte T. 2022. Genomic signatures of sexual

selection on pollen-expressed genes in *Arabis alpina*. *Molecular Biology and*

Evolution **39**: msab349.

Haas BJ, Papanicolaou A, Yassour M, Grabherr M, Blood PD, Bowden J, Couger

MB, Eccles D, Li B, Lieber M, et al. 2013. *De novo* transcript sequence

reconstruction from RNA-seq using the Trinity platform for reference

generation and analysis. *Nature Protocols* **8**: 1494-1512.

Hajdu A, Adam E, Sheerin DJ, Dobos O, Bernula P, Hiltbrunner A, Kozma-Bognar L,

Nagy F. 2015. High-level expression and phosphorylation of phytochrome B

modulates flowering time in *Arabidopsis*. *Plant Journal* **83**: 794-805.

Hambuch TM, Parsch J. 2005. Patterns of synonymous codon usage in *Drosophila*

melanogaster genes with sex-biased expression. *Genetics* **170**: 1691-1700.

Harkess A, Mercati F, Shan HY, Sunseri F, Falavigna A, Leebens-Mack J. 2015. Sex-

biased gene expression in dioecious garden asparagus (*Asparagus officinalis*).

New Phytologist **207**: 883-892.

Harrison MC, Mallon EB, Twell D, Hammond RL. 2019. Deleterious mutation

accumulation in *Arabidopsis thaliana* pollen genes: a role for a recent

relaxation of selection. *Genome Biology and Evolution* **11**: 1939-1951.

Harrison PW, Wright AE, Zimmer F, Dean R, Montgomery SH, Pointer MA, Mank

JE. 2015. Sexual selection drives evolution and rapid turnover of male gene

expression. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United*

States of America **112**: 4393-4398.

Hatchett WJ, Jueterbock AO, Kopp M, Coyer JA, Coelho SM, Hoarau G, Lipinska AP.

2023. Evolutionary dynamics of sex-biased gene expression in a young XY system:

Insights from the brown alga genus *Fucus*. *New Phytologist* **238**: 422-437.

Hou JJ, Fan WW, Ma RR, Li B, Yuan ZH, Huang WX, Wu YY, Hu Q, Lin CJ, Zhao

XQ, et al. 2022. *MALE STERILITY 3* encodes a plant homeodomain-finger

protein for male fertility in soybean. *Journal of Integrative Plant Biology* **64**:

1076-1086.

Hough J, Hollister JD, Wang W, Barrett SCH, Wright SI. 2014. Genetic degeneration

of old and young Y chromosomes in the flowering plant *Rumex hastatulus*.

Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences **111**: 7713-7718.

Hsu S-K, Jakšić AM, Nolte V, Lirakis M, Kofler R, Barghi N, Versace E, Schlötterer

C. 2020. Rapid sex-specific adaptation to high temperature in *Drosophila*.

Elife **9**: e53237.

Hu XQ, Liao ZY, Zhang B, Yue JJ, Wang Z, Jie X, Liu J. 2020. Transcriptome

sequencing and screening of genes related to sex determination of

Trichosanthes kirilowii Maxim. *PLoS One* **15**: e0239230.

Hudson M, Smith H. 1998. The phytochrome B encoded by the *HLG* locus of

Nicotiana plumbaginifolia is required for detection of photoperiod: *hlg*

mutants show altered regulation of flowering and circadian movement. *Plant*

Journal **15**: 281-287.

Immler S. 2019. Haploid selection in "diploid" organisms. *Annual Review of Ecology,*

Evolution, and Systematics **50**: 219-236.

Jones P, Binns D, Chang HY, Fraser M, Li W, McAnulla C, McWilliam H, Maslen J,

Mitchell A, Nuka G, et al. 2014. InterProScan 5: genome-scale protein

function classification. *Bioinformatics* **30**: 1236-1240.

Khodursky S, Svetec N, Durkin SM, Zhao L. 2020. The evolution of sex-biased gene

expression in the *Drosophila* brain. *Genome Research* **30**: 874-884.

Lahti DC, Johnson NA, Ajie BC, Otto SP, Hendry AP, Blumstein DT, Coss RG,

Donohue K, Foster SA. 2009. Relaxed selection in the wild. *Trends in Ecology*

and Evolution **24**: 487-496.

Langmead B, Salzberg SL. 2012. Fast gapped-read alignment with Bowtie 2. *Nature*

Methods **9**: 357-359.

Li B, Dewey CN. 2011. RSEM: accurate transcript quantification from RNA-Seq data

with or without a reference genome. *BMC Bioinformatics* **12**: 323.

Li SH, Yan H, Mei WM, Tse YC, Wang H. 2020. Boosting autophagy in sexual

reproduction: a plant perspective. *New Phytologist* **226**: 679-689.

Lichilin N, El Taher A, Bohne A. 2021. Sex-biased gene expression and recent sex

chromosome turnover. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B:*

Biological Sciences **376**: 20200107.

Lipinska A, Cormier A, Luthringer R, Peters AF, Corre E, Gachon CM, Cock JM,

Coelho SM. 2015. Sexual dimorphism and the evolution of sex-biased gene

expression in the brown alga *ectocarpus*. *Molecular Biology and Evolution* **32**:

1581-1597.

Liu ZH, Tavares R, Forsythe ES, Andre F, Lugan R, Jonasson G, Boutet-Mercey S,

Tohge T, Beilstein MA, et al. 2016. Evolutionary interplay between sister

cytochrome P450 genes shapes plasticity in plant metabolism. *Nature*

Communications **7**: 13026.

Liu Y, Bassham DC. 2012. Autophagy: pathways for self-eating in plant cells. *Annual*

Review of Plant Biology **63**: 215-237.

Love MI, Huber W, Anders S. 2014. Moderated estimation of fold change and

dispersion for RNA-seq data with DESeq2. *Genome Biology* **15**: 550.

Lynch M, Conery JS. 2000. The evolutionary fate and consequences of duplicate genes.

Science **290**: 1151-1155.

Lynch M, Katju V. 2004. The altered evolutionary trajectories of gene duplicates.

Trends in Genetics **20**: 544-549.

Ma LL, Wang Q, Mu JL, Fu AZ, Wen CL, Zhao XY, Gao LP, Li J, Shi K, Wang YX,

et al. 2020. The genome and transcriptome analysis of snake gourd provide

insights into its evolution and fruit development and ripening. *Horticulture*

Research **7**: 199.

Ma WJ, Pannell JR. 2016. Sex determination: separate sexes are a double turnoff in

melons. *Current Biology* **26**: R171-R174.

Mank JE. 2009. Sex chromosomes and the evolution of sexual dimorphism: lessons

from the genome. *American Naturalist* **173**: 141-150.

Mank JE. 2017. The transcriptional architecture of phenotypic dimorphism. *Nature*

Ecology and Evolution **1**: 6.

Mank JE. 2023. Sex-specific morphs: the genetics and evolution of intra-sexual

variation. *Nature Reviews Genetics* **24**: 44-52.

Mank JE, Hultin-Rosenberg L, Axelsson E, Ellegren H. 2007. Rapid evolution of

female-biased, but not male-biased, genes expressed in the avian brain.

Molecular Biology and Evolution **24**: 2698-2706.

Mao XZ, Cai T, Olyarchuk JG, Wei LP. 2005. Automated genome annotation and

pathway identification using the KEGG Orthology (KO) as a controlled

vocabulary. *Bioinformatics* **21**: 3787-3793.

Marinić M, Lynch VJ. 2020. Relaxed constraint and functional divergence of the

progesterone receptor (*PGR*) in the human stem-lineage. *PLOS Genetics* **16**:

e1008666.

Meisel RP. 2011. Towards a more nuanced understanding of the relationship between

sex-biased gene expression and rates of protein-coding sequence evolution.

Molecular Biology and Evolution **28**: 1893-1900.

Meisel RP, Connallon T. 2013. The faster-X effect: integrating theory and data.

Trends in Genetics **29**: 537-544.

Ming R, Bendahmane A, Renner SS. 2011. Sex chromosomes in land plants. *Annual*

Review of Plant Biology **62**: 485-514.

Moore JC, Pannell JR. 2011. Sexual selection in plants. *Current Biology* **21**: R176-

R182.

Moriya Y, Itoh M, Okuda S, Yoshizawa AC, Kanehisa M. 2007. KAAS: an automatic genome annotation and pathway reconstruction server. *Nucleic Acids Research* **35**: W182-185.

Moyle LC, Wu M, Gibson MJS. 2021. Reproductive proteins evolve faster than non-reproductive proteins among *Solanum* species. *Frontiers in Plant Science* **12**: 635990.

Murat F, Mbengue N, Winge SB, Trefzer T, Leushkin E, Sepp M, Cardoso-Moreira M, Schmidt J, Schneider C, Mößinger K, et al. 2023. The molecular evolution of spermatogenesis across mammals. *Nature* **613**: 308-316.

Murrell B, Weaver S, Smith MD, Wertheim JO, Murrell S, Aylward A, Eren K, Pollner T, Martin DP, Smith DM, et al. 2015. Gene-wide identification of episodic selection. *Molecular Biology and Evolution* **32**: 1365-1371.

Muschietti JP, Wengier DL. 2018. How many receptor-like kinases are required to operate a pollen tube. *Current Opinion in Plant Biology* **41**: 73-82.

Muyle A. 2019. How different is the evolution of sex-biased gene expression between plants and animals? A commentary on: 'Sexual dimorphism and rapid turnover in gene expression in prereproductive seedlings of a dioecious herb'. *Annals of Botany* **123**: iv-v.

Naqvi S, Godfrey AK, Hughes JF, Goodheart ML, Mitchell RN, Page DC. 2019. Conservation, acquisition, and functional impact of sex-biased gene expression in mammals. *Science* **365**: eaaw7317.

Palmer DH, Rogers TF, Dean R, Wright AE. 2019. How to identify sex chromosomes

and their turnover. *Molecular ecology* **28**: 4709-4724.

Papa F, Windbichler N, Waterhouse RM, Cagnetti A, D'Amato R, Persampieri T,

Lawniczak MKN, Nolan T, Papathanos PA. 2017. Rapid evolution of female-

biased genes among four species of *Anopheles* malaria mosquitoes. *Genome*

Research **27**: 1536-1548.

Parsch J, Ellegren H. 2013. The evolutionary causes and consequences of sex-biased

gene expression. *Nature Reviews Genetics* **14**: 83-87.

Parvathy ST, Udayasuriyan V, Bhadana V. 2022. Codon usage bias. *Molecular*

Biology Reports **49**: 539-565.

Pond SLK, Poon AFY, Velazquez R, Weaver S, Hepler NL, Murrell B, Shank SD,

Magalis BR, Bouvier D, Nekrutenko A, et al. 2020. HyPhy 2.5–a customizable

platform for evolutionary hypothesis testing using phylogenies. *Molecular*

Biology and Evolution **37**: 295-299.

Pröschel M, Zhang Z, Parsch J. 2006. Widespread adaptive evolution of *Drosophila*

genes with sex-biased expression. *Genetics* **174**: 893-900.

Ren J, Wu Y, Zhu Z, Chen R, Zhang L. 2022. Biosynthesis and regulation of

diterpenoids in medicinal plants. *Chinese Journal of Natural Medicines* **20**:

761-772.

Renner SS. 2014. The relative and absolute frequencies of angiosperm sexual

systems: dioecy, monoecy, gynodioecy, and an updated online database.

American Journal of Botany **101**: 1588-1596.

Rowe L, Chenoweth SF, Agrawal AF. 2018. The genomics of sexual conflict. *American Naturalist* **192**: 274-286.

Sanderson BJ, Wang L, Tiffin P, Wu ZQ, Olson MS. 2019. Sex-biased gene expression in flowers, but not leaves, reveals secondary sexual dimorphism in *Populus balsamifera. New Phytologist* **221**: 527-539.

Sandler G, Beaudry FEG, Barrett SCH, Wright SI. 2018. The effects of haploid selection on Y chromosome evolution in two closely related dioecious plants. *Evolution Letters* **2**: 368-377.

Schaefer H, Renner SS. 2010. A three-genome phylogeny of *Momordica* (Cucurbitaceae) suggests seven returns from dioecy to monoecy and recent long-distance dispersal to Asia. *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution* **54**: 553-560.

Schaefer H, Renner SS. 2011. Phylogenetic relationships in the order Cucurbitales and a new classification of the gourd family (Cucurbitaceae). *Taxon* **60**: 122-138.

Scharf KD, Berberich T, Ebersberger I, Nover L. 2012. The plant heat stress transcription factor (Hsf) family: structure, function and evolution. *Biochimica Et Biophysica Acta-Gene Regulatory Mechanisms* **1819**: 104-119.

Scharmann M, Rebelo AG, Pannell JR. 2021. High rates of evolution preceded shifts to sex-biased gene expression in *Leucadendron*, the most sexually dimorphic angiosperms. *eLife* **10**: e67485.

Schrader L, Pan H, Bollazzi M, Schiott M, Larabee FJ, Bi X, Deng Y, Zhang G,

Boomsma JJ, Rabeling C. 2021. Relaxed selection underlies genome erosion

in socially parasitic ant species. *Nature Communications* **12**: 2918.

Seppey M, Manni M, Zdobnov EM. 2019. BUSCO: Assessing genome assembly and

annotation completeness. *Methods in Molecular Biology* **1962**: 227-245.

Shiryev SA, Papadopoulos JS, Schaffer AA, Agarwala R. 2007. Improved BLAST

searches using longer words for protein seeding. *Bioinformatics* **23**: 2949-

2951.

Singh A, Agrawal AF. 2023. Two forms of sexual dimorphism in gene expression in

Drosophila melanogaster: their coincidence and evolutionary genetics.

Molecular Biology and Evolution **40**: msad091.

Skogsmyr I, Lankinen A. 2002. Sexual selection: an evolutionary force in plants.

Biological Reviews **77**: 537-562.

Smith MD, Wertheim JO, Weaver S, Murrell B, Scheffler K, Pond SLK. 2015. Less is

more: an adaptive branch-site random effects model for efficient detection of

episodic diversifying selection. *Molecular Biology and Evolution* **32**: 1342-

1353.

Stephenson AG, Bertin RI. 1983. Male competition, female choice, and sexual

selection in plants. In: Real L (Eds). *Pollination Biology*. New York, NY,

USA: Academic Press. p.109-151.

Teo ZWN, Song SY, Wang YQ, Liu J, Yu H. 2014. New insights into the regulation of

inflorescence architecture. *Trends in Plant Science* **19**: 158-165.

Tosto NM, Beasley ER, Wong BBM, Mank JE, Flanagan SP. 2023. The roles of sexual

selection and sexual conflict in shaping patterns of genome and transcriptome

variation. *Nature Ecology and Evolution* **7**: 981-993

Toubiana W, Armisén D, Dechaud C, Arbore R, Khila A. 2021. Impact of male trait

exaggeration on sex-biased gene expression and genome architecture in a

water strider. *BMC Biology* **19**: 89

Vaughan MM, Wang Q, Webster FX, Kiemle D, Hong YJ, Tantillo DJ, Coates RM,

Wray AT, Askew W, O'Donnell C, *et al.* 2013. Formation of the unusual

semivolatile diterpene rhizathalene by the *Arabidopsis* class I terpene synthase

TPS08 in the root stele is involved in defense against belowground herbivory.

The Plant Cell **25**: 1108-1125.

Veltsos P. 2019. Not all sex-biased genes are the same. *New Phytologist* **221**: 10-11.

Wertheim JO, Murrell B, Smith MD, Kosakovsky Pond SL, Scheffler K. 2015.

RELAX: detecting relaxed selection in a phylogenetic framework. *Molecular*

Biology and Evolution **32**: 820-832.

Whittle CA, Kulkarni A, Extavour CG. 2021. Evolutionary dynamics of sex-biased

genes expressed in cricket brains and gonads. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology*

34: 1188-1211.

Williams JH, Reese JB. 2019. Evolution of development of pollen performance.

Current Topics in Developmental Biology **131**: 299-336.

Wright AE, Harrison PW, Zimmer F, Montgomery SH, Pointer MA, Mank JE. 2015.

Variation in promiscuity and sexual selection drives avian rate of Faster-Z

evolution. *Molecular Ecology* **24**: 1218-1235.

Wright F. 1990. The effective number of codons used in a gene. *Gene* **87**: 23-29.

Wu H, Zhao G, Gong H, Li J, Luo C, He X, Luo S, Zheng X, Liu X, Guo J, et al.

2020. A high-quality sponge gourd (*Luffa cylindrica*) genome. *Horticulture*

Research **7**: 128.

Wu Z, Raven P, Hong D. 2011. *Flora of China.* Beijing, China: Science Press, and St.

Louis, USA: Missouri Botanical Garden Press.

Yang Z. 2007. PAML 4: phylogenetic analysis by maximum likelihood. *Molecular*

Biology and Evolution **24**: 1586-1591.

Yang ZH, Wong WSW, Nielsen R. 2005. Bayes empirical bayes inference of amino

acid sites under positive selection. *Molecular Biology and Evolution* **22**: 1107-

1118.

Yue T, Guo Y, Qi X, Zheng W, Zhang H, Wang B, Liu K, Zhou B, Zeng X,

Ouzhuluobu, He Y, Su B. 2023. Sex-biased regulatory changes in the placenta

of native highlanders contribute to adaptive fetal development. *eLife* **12**:

RP89004

Zemp N, Tavares R, Muyle A, Charlesworth D, Marais GA, Widmer A. 2016.

Evolution of sex-biased gene expression in a dioecious plant. *Nature Plants* **2**:

16168.

Zhang JZ, Nielsen R, Yang ZH. 2005. Evaluation of an improved branch-site

likelihood method for detecting positive selection at the molecular level.

Molecular Biology and Evolution **22**: 2472-2479.

Zhang MM, Zhang SQ. 2022. Mitogen-activated protein kinase cascades in plant

signaling. *Journal of Integrative Plant Biology* **64**: 301-341.

Zhang LB, Simmons MP, Kocyan A, Renner SS. 2006. Phylogeny of the

Cucurbitales based on DNA sequences of nine loci from three genomes:

implications for morphological and sexual system evolution. *Molecular*

Phylogenetics and Evolution **39**: 305-322.

Zheng Y, Wu S, Bai Y, Sun HH, Jiao C, Guo SG, Zhao K, Blanca J, Zhang ZH,

Huang SW, et al. 2019. Cucurbit Genomics Database (CuGenDB): a central

portal for comparative and functional genomics of cucurbit crops. *Nucleic*

Acids Research **47**: D1128-D1136.

Zhang Y, Sturgill D, Parisi M, Kumar S, Oliver B. 2007. Constraint and turnover in

sex-biased gene expression in the genus *Drosophila*. *Nature* **450**: 233-237.

Zhang YW, Li ZW, Ma B, Hou QC, Wan XY. 2020. Phylogeny and functions of LOB

domain proteins in plants. *International Journal of Molecular Sciences* **21**:

2278.

Zhang Z, Hambuch TM, Parsch J. 2004. Molecular evolution of sex-biased genes in

Drosophila. *Molecular Biology and Evolution* **21**: 2130-2139.

Zhang Z, Parsch J. 2005. Positive correlation between evolutionary rate and

recombination rate in *Drosophila* genes with male-biased expression.

Molecular Biology and Evolution **22**: 1945-1947.

Zhou XM, Zhao P, Sun MX. 2021. Autophagy in sexual plant reproduction: new

insights. *Journal of Experimental Botany* **72**: 7658-7667.

Zhou XM, Zhao P, Wang W, Zou J, Cheng TH, Peng XB, Sun MX. 2015. A

comprehensive, genome-wide analysis of autophagy-related genes identified

in tobacco suggests a central role of autophagy in plant response to various

environmental cues. *DNA Research* **22**: 245-257.

Figure Legends

Fig. 1 Floral buds and flowers at anthesis of females (A, B) and males (C) in

Trichosanthes pilosa.

Fig. 2 Sex-biased gene expression for floral buds and flowers at anthesis in males and

females of *Trichosanthes pilosa.* Volcano plots of average expression between female-

biased, male-biased and unbiased genes in floral buds (A) and flowers at anthesis (B).

M1 and F1 indicate male and female floral buds; M2 and F2 indicate male and female

flowers at anthesis. The value of y coordinate represents -$\log_{10}$(FDR), and the value of

x coordinate represents $\log_2$(Fold Change) identified by DESeq2. Heatmap of sex-

biased gene expression (C) using hierarchical clustering analysis. Hierarchical gene

clustering is based on Euclidean distance with an average of $\log_2$(FPKM) for

differentially expressed genes. The color gradient represents from high to low (from

red to green) gene expression.

Fig. 3 The overlap between sex-biased and tissue-biased genes in two types of sexes

and tissues. Male-biased genes in floral buds (M1BGs) (A) or flowers at anthesis

(M2BGs) (B) overlapped with tissue-biased genes in floral buds (M1TGs) and

flowers at anthesis (M2TGs). Female-biased genes in floral buds (F1BGs) (C) or

flowers at anthesis (F2BGs) (D) overlapped with tissue-biased genes in floral buds

(F1TGs) and flowers at anthesis (F2TGs).

Fig. 4 Violin plots of d_N/d_S values ($0 < \omega < 2$) of female-biased, male-biased and

unbiased genes in floral buds and flowers at anthesis of *Trichosanthes pilosa*. White

dot indicates the median of d_N/d_S values for sex-biased and unbiased genes. Wilcoxon

rank sum tests are used to test for significant differences (***$P < 0.0005$, **$P < 0.005$

and *$P < 0.05$). The distributions of d_N/d_S values for female-biased, male-biased and

unbiased genes in floral buds (A) and flowers at anthesis (B) using 'two-ratio' branch

model. The distributions of d_N/d_S values for female-biased, male-biased and unbiased

genes in floral buds (C) and flowers at anthesis (D) using 'free-ratio' branch model.

Fig. 5 Venn diagrams of male-biased genes detected to be under positive selection

using aBSREL, BUSTED, CodeML and RELAX in floral buds.

1155

A Two-Ratio Model: Floral buds

B Two-Ratio Model: Mature flowers

C Free-Ratio Model: Floral buds

D Free-Ratio Model: Mature flowers